

975.2

S-1-A

2 copies

Duplicate

20083277

2/3/6/3

RECOMMENDATIONS  
OF THE MARYLAND COMMISSION  
ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Appointed by

Honorable Herbert R. O'Connor, Governor of Maryland

WILLIAM L. MARBURY, *Chairman*

T. HOWARD DUCKETT  
ARTHUR H. HAWKINS  
JOHN M. MCFALL  
E. L. MILES

CARL MURPHY  
MRS. JOHN C. SHAW  
HARVEY B. STONE  
TALBOT T. SPEER

*Survey Staff*

JOHN DALE RUSSELL, *Director*

WILLIAM E. ARNOLD, University of Pennsylvania  
WILLIAM J. HAGGERTY, New Paltz State Teachers College  
MARTIN D. JENKINS, Howard University  
LEONARD V. KOOS, University of Chicago  
ORVIN T. RICHARDSON, Ball State Teachers College  
W. T. SANGER, Medical College of Virginia

RECEIVED

FEB 5 1947

February 1, 1947

MARYLAND STATE LIBRARY  
ANNAPOLIS, MD.

MARYLAND  
STATE LIBRARY

# RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE MARYLAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

Appointed by

Honorable Herbert R. O'Connor, Governor of Maryland

WILLIAM L. MARBURY, *Chairman*

T. HOWARD DUCKETT

ARTHUR H. HAWKINS

JOHN M. McFALL

E. L. MILES

CARL MURPHY

MRS. JOHN C. SHAW

HARVEY B. STONE

TALBOT T. SPEER

*Survey Staff*

JOHN DALE RUSSELL, *Director*

WILLIAM E. ARNOLD, University of Pennsylvania

WILLIAM J. HAGGERTY, New Paltz State Teachers College

MARTIN D. JENKINS, Howard University

LEONARD V. KOOS, University of Chicago

ORVIN T. RICHARDSON, Ball State Teachers College

W. T. SANGER, Medical College of Virginia

February 1, 1947

*Preprinted from*

HIGHER EDUCATION IN MARYLAND

A Report of a Survey Made by the American Council on  
Education with Recommendations of the Maryland  
Commission on Higher Education

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

TO THE GOVERNOR AND LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL:

The report of the Commission on Higher Education, appointed pursuant to Chapter 716 of the Acts of 1945, is submitted herewith.

Your Commission held its organization meeting on February 23, 1946, less than ten days after the appointment of its chairman. It was at once determined that expert help would be needed if the Commission were to perform its allotted task in a satisfactory manner. Diligent efforts were promptly made to get that help, and after protracted efforts the Commission finally succeeded in negotiating a contract with the American Council on Education to conduct a survey of higher education in Maryland and to furnish expert advice and assistance to the Commission in the preparation of its report. The American Council on Education chose Dean John Dale Russell, professor of education at the University of Chicago and now head of the Division of Higher Education of the United States Office of Education, to head the survey.

Dr. Russell's prior commitments did not permit him to meet the Commission until July 12, at which time plans for the survey were considered and agreed upon. The survey staff was then assembled and the work of investigation was begun. Much of the necessary information could not be obtained until after the beginning of the academic year in late September, so that it was not until early in December that the work of investigation was completed. The time in which to organize and study the material developed by the investigation has been all too brief.

In view of this record, no apologies are offered for the delay in submitting this report, but the Commission begs indulgence for any errors and omissions which haste may have brought about.

In addition to Dr. Russell, the Commission has had the assistance of Dr. Orvin T. Richardson, now Dean of Student Affairs at Ball State Teachers College in Indiana, who has borne a large part of the burden of the work of investigation.

and who has acted as secretary of the Commission. We have also had the benefit of special investigations by Dr. W. T. Sanger, president of the Medical College of Virginia, who made a study of the needs of the State of Maryland in medical education; by Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, professor of education at Howard University, who made a special study of the field of Negro education; by Dr. Leonard V. Koos, professor of secondary education at the University of Chicago, who made a special study of the junior college situation; by Dr. William E. Arnold, professor of education at the University of Pennsylvania, who made a special study of the physical plants of the state-supported institutions; and by Dr. William J. Haggerty, president of the New Paltz State Teachers College in New York, who made a special study of teacher education. Their findings are embodied in the survey report which is attached to the recommendations of the Commission. Because of the length of the survey report, only a limited number of copies have been printed. Copies of the complete report of the Commission and of the survey staff, bound in a single volume, may be obtained from the American Council on Education, 744 Jackson Place, Washington, D.C.

Your Commission wishes to express its grateful appreciation to Dr. Russell and his staff, and particularly to Dr. Richardson who has carried the heavy load of detail, for their excellent survey. They have made a contribution to the State of Maryland which will prove to be of lasting value. While Dr. Russell and his staff are in no way responsible for the recommendations of the Commission, their advice has been invaluable.

MARYLAND COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

T. HOWARD DUCKETT	CARL MURPHY
ARTHUR H. HAWKINS	MRS. JOHN C. SHAW
JOHN M. MCFALL	HARVEY B. STONE
E. L. MILES	TALBOT T. SPEER

WILLIAM L. MARBURY  
*Chairman*

February 1, 1947

## CONTENTS

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL.....	PAGE iii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE FUTURE NEEDS OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND IN THE FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATION .....	2
III. THE EXPENDITURE OF THE FUNDS NOW BEING AP- PROPRIATED .....	5
The University of Maryland.....	7
Morgan State College.....	10
State Teachers Colleges.....	11
St. Mary's Female Seminary.....	12
Private Institutions Receiving State Aid.....	12
Johns Hopkins University.....	12
Western Maryland College.....	12
Washington College .....	13
St. John's College.....	13
IV. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE.....	15
1. A System of Junior Colleges.....	17
2. The University of Maryland.....	18
A. The School of Medicine.....	21
B. The School of Nursing .....	23
C. The College of Engineering .....	23
3. Morgan State College.....	24
4. Teacher Training .....	27
5. Washington College .....	29
6. A Scholarship Program.....	30
7. The Johns Hopkins School of Engineering .....	33
8. The Abandonment of Princess Anne Col- lege, St. Mary's Female Seminary, Cop- pin Teachers College, and Frostburg State Teachers College.....	33

CHAPTER	PAGE
9. An Adequate Salary Scale.....	34
10. A Future Building Program.....	34
V. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE IN- STITUTIONS WHICH IT SUPPORTS.....	36
VI. A PERMANENT STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION	42
VII. CONCLUSION .....	45
VIII. MINORITY REPORT, Submitted by Carl Murphy....	46

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

The duties of the Commission are plainly stated in the law which is its charter. They are:

(1) To study and investigate the whole field of higher education, in order to determine the higher educational requirements for such future period as said Commission shall deem proper and practicable;

(2) To study and report as to the expenditure of the funds now being appropriated by the State to higher educational institutions in the State, the results being obtained by the expenditure of such funds, to what extent such funds are being used to subsidize non-resident students, and whether the institutions receiving State aid are complying with the terms under which the State appropriations are made;

(3) To formulate a general plan or program to be followed by the State in meeting its obligations in the field of higher education for such future period as said Commission shall determine;

(4) To state what it considers should be the relationship between the several higher educational institutions receiving State funds and the State, and particularly as to the scope and area which each of such institutions shall cover.

This statement of our task seems to us to furnish the outline to be followed in making this report.

## **II. THE FUTURE NEEDS OF THE STATE OF MARYLAND IN THE FIELD OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

In order that our recommendations may be fairly judged, the members of the Commission feel that we should make clear at the outset some of the premises upon which we have proceeded in estimating the future needs of the State of Maryland in the field of higher education.

To begin, we accept as axiomatic that higher education in a democratic society should be available on an equal basis to all those who have the ability and the desire to benefit by it. We agree with Dr. James B. Conant, the president of Harvard University, that "it is a principle of this republic that inheritance shall not determine the opportunity for education nor its scope." Inability to pay their way should not prevent our boys and girls from receiving the education needed to equip them for the walk of life for which they are best fitted.

This simple principle has long been accepted in its application to public education at the elementary and secondary school level, but we have been slow in recognizing its relevance to the field of so-called higher education. It is only recently that there has been brought home to us the fact that many students require longer periods of training to prepare themselves for the place which they should fill in the complex industrial society in which we now live. We are coming to realize that the claim of the student with special qualifications for a career as an electrical engineer, for example, is on a parity with the claim of the student who expects to spend his life as a mechanic at a bench. Each should have the opportunity to get the training necessary to do the job for which he is best fitted.

Turning from general principles to a more concrete question, your Commission believes that more of the young men and women of Maryland should continue their education beyond the secondary school level. We have been profoundly impressed with the fact that Maryland stands forty-fifth



among the states in the percentage of its youth between the ages of eighteen and twenty who are still in school. Considered in the light of the growing industrialization of our economy, this seems to us to be ominous. We like to think that our state possesses in a high degree the characteristics of a civilized community, but we cannot fail to realize that these cannot long be maintained if the general level of education of the population is allowed to fall so low that we are not prepared to cope with the social pressures that industrialization inevitably brings in its train.

This does not mean that the Commission accepts the view that every boy and girl should go to college. Doubtless there are many whose time can be otherwise employed with greater benefit to themselves and society as a whole. However, unless there is something radically wrong with the type of post high school education which this community affords, it seems evident to us that we should all benefit if more of our youth were to continue their education for longer periods.

A further premise which we have adopted in reaching our conclusions is that many of our young men and women will find their places in walks of life which do not require the type of education now available in the institutions of higher education which are found within the borders of this state. This may explain, and to some extent justify, the relatively low percentage of those who pursue their education beyond the high school level. In calculating the needs for higher education, we feel that the requirements of this large segment of our youth should be taken into account and that we should include those who need no more than two years' training beyond high school to prepare them adequately for the responsibilities which they will be called upon to meet.

A final assumption is that the needs of the state in the field of higher education can properly be measured by the demand of its qualified citizens for that kind of training. The fact that the state would probably not lack for lawyers if every law school in the state were to close its doors tomorrow does not seem to your Commission to mean that there

is no need for facilities for the training of lawyers. If there is overproduction in any given field, it may be assumed that the demand for that kind of training will diminish. It is from this point of view that we have examined the estimates found in the survey report of the numbers of doctors, lawyers, engineers, and other professional people which the state is likely to need.

In the light of these basic premises, your Commission has examined the data which have been collected in the report of the survey staff. These data are too voluminous to be even summarized here; to appreciate their significance, a reading of chapter i of the report of the survey staff is necessary. It has led us inescapably to the conclusion that in order to meet the future requirements of the state in the field of higher education, three fundamental needs must be met:

*First*, the state should offer the students who graduate from its secondary schools a greater variety of courses than those which are now available in its institutions of higher education.

*Second*, the state should make available in widely distributed units two years of post secondary school training in a variety of subjects ranging from general education to strictly vocational studies.

*Third*, the state should be prepared to afford these opportunities to a much larger number of students than in the pre-war years.

In reaching these conclusions, your Commission has taken into account the extraordinary conditions now prevailing as a result of the war and the passage by Congress of the GI Bill of Rights. We have proceeded on the assumption that this is a temporary condition which will be taken care of within the next few years. We recognize the possibility that a national universal training program such as has been proposed may lead to some form of extension of those legislative provisions which have produced such a tremendous flood of applicants at the door of every institution of higher education in this state, but in reaching our conclusions we have not been influenced by this possibility.

### **III. THE EXPENDITURE OF THE FUNDS NOW BEING APPROPRIATED**

Your Commission believes that funds now being appropriated by the state to higher educational institutions are, on the whole, being well spent. However, the fact that there are exceptions to the general rule is apparent from the report of our survey staff. In view of the conclusions already stated as to the extent of the future needs in higher education, we think that it should be evident that every dollar devoted to this purpose must be spent as efficiently as possible. We are too far behind the procession to allow ourselves to be influenced by sentiment or by local considerations.

Your Commission has, therefore, undertaken to examine our educational institutions with a critical eye to see whether the money which the state is appropriating for the purposes of higher education is being spent to the best advantage. We have not been so much concerned with the merits or demerits of the administration of any particular institution (although the report of our survey staff contains much useful information on this point) as with the nature of the agencies through which the state is seeking to meet its educational needs. We have tried to ask the fundamental question whether those agencies are the best which the state can develop in order to give its citizens an opportunity to receive the training which will best fit them for the position in society which they can most usefully fill. In short, we have looked for faults of organization in the confidence that if these are corrected the people of this state can be counted on to insist on sound administration.

We think that we have found some faults of organization; indeed, it would be astonishing if we had not done so. In view of the lack of any state agency charged with responsibility for the development of an integrated plan of higher education for the state as a whole and of the consequent almost haphazard development of our system, it is remark-

able that we have not found more to criticize. This state is fortunate, for example, in the very few cases of duplication of work by its institutions of higher education. It is also very fortunate in the possession of some excellent privately owned and operated institutions of higher education which are caring for the educational needs of many of our citizens in a way which could hardly be improved upon. The mere presence in the community of such institutions as The Johns Hopkins University and Goucher College, to name some of those which have a national reputation, raises the general standard of well-being of our people. In the field of medicine alone, the influence of the Johns Hopkins Medical School and of the Johns Hopkins Hospital in elevating the standard of medical care available to citizens of this state can hardly be overestimated. It is felt in every hospital and in every clinic in the state.

These facts may explain to some extent the continuance in this state of the policy (long since abandoned elsewhere) of state aid to privately controlled institutions. Perhaps the people of Maryland have thought of higher education as a job for private institutions with the state filling in the gaps. Your Commission believes that the facts developed in chapter i of the report of our survey staff should finally dispose of this idea. As we have already stated, the education of youth seems to us to be a burden which is bound to grow ever heavier as our civilization increases in complexity. That burden does not stop at the high school level; it does not stop until all our boys and girls have received the training they need to take the places in society to which their capacity and industry justify them to aspire. The task is undoubtedly lightened by the activities of private institutions. However, a realistic appraisal of the contribution which they can make without sacrifice of their essential characteristics seems to us to make it very clear that the major burden of affording post high school training must be borne from now on by state-controlled institutions, and for this purpose a well-integrated system is needed. (See especially chapter ii of the survey report.)

With this in mind, we turn to a brief examination of the system as it now exists in this state as it is described in chapter ii of the report of our survey staff. In commenting on the agencies for post high school training now available, we shall try to give categorical answers to the special questions referred to in the law creating this Commission.

#### THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

At College Park the University of Maryland has a large physical plant where nearly eight thousand young men and women are now receiving post high school training. The courses offered are wide in scope covering generally the liberal arts, the basic sciences, engineering, business and public administration, home economics, agriculture, and teacher training. In addition to the College Park schools, the University of Maryland offers professional training at its Baltimore schools in law, medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and nursing. Finally, the University of Maryland is attempting to conduct at Princess Anne College in Worcester County a school of agriculture and mechanic arts for Negroes.

Prior to 1920 the position of the University of Maryland in the educational pattern of our state was useful but inconspicuous. Today it holds the limelight to such a degree that the glare tends to make us unable to see how great has been the accomplishment. Your Commission ventures to believe that many people will learn with some surprise that the College Park schools of the University of Maryland, measured by the standards customarily applied in surveys of this character, rank well above the average of similar institutions elsewhere. The facts set forth in chapter v of the report of our survey staff seem to make it clear that we have in the University of Maryland an institution which can hold up its head among state universities of greater age and larger financial resources. This is an accomplishment in which the state can take legitimate pride.

In the professional schools a somewhat different situation exists. Over a long period of years they have acquired a reputation for good work, which it is the habit of the

people of the state to take more or less for granted. As far as your Commission has been able to observe, the schools of law, pharmacy, and dentistry fully deserve their good reputation. However, chapter v of the report of our survey staff shows that the schools of medicine and of nursing face a near crisis, and unless prompt action is taken to increase their resources, their usefulness to the state seems certain to be greatly impaired.

Princess Anne College is far below standard, as the report of our survey staff clearly shows. This is frankly admitted by the President of the University, who attributes this condition directly to the lack of adequate state support for the school.

Our survey staff has noted certain weaknesses of organization in the University of Maryland which we believe should have the attention of the Board of Regents. We place special emphasis on an apparent overcentralization of administration which tends to deprive the members of the faculty and staff of a sense of security and to make them feel that they are not participating in the formulation of the program which they are to execute. We have been informed that this condition has been responsible for the failure of the University to obtain the services of some valuable men. In this connection, we have been advised that legal doubts have arisen as to the authority of the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland to control the appointment and removal of members of the staff and of the faculty of the various components of the University. We strongly recommend the prompt passage of legislation which will set these doubts at rest and which will make it perfectly clear that the president of the University acts at all times under the direction and control of the Board of Regents. The present concentration of authority in the president has, in our judgment, had a definitely harmful effect on morale, and is, in part at least, responsible for some of the incidents which have recently tended to disturb public confidence in the institution.

A further word should be said on a subject upon which we are particularly required to comment, namely, the extent to which funds now being appropriated to the University of Maryland are being used to subsidize nonresident students. To begin with, it should be borne in mind that education beyond high school cannot be fully paid for by tuition fees. Unless we want to shut the doors of the University of Maryland to students from other states, we cannot afford to make them pay the full cost of their education. The admission of any out-of-state students, therefore, necessarily involves some degree of subsidy from state funds. Your Commission believes that no institution of higher education should entirely close its doors to students from other states; to do so would, it seems to us, lead to provincialism and complacency which, to express it mildly, are serious faults in any educational institution. On the other hand, the facts shown in the report of our survey staff seem to us to demonstrate that the enrollment of nonresident students from the District of Columbia, particularly in the College of Engineering, is excessive and imposes an unreasonable burden on the taxpayers of this state. In this connection it is noteworthy that students from the District of Columbia, although required to pay more tuition than Maryland students, are paying less tuition than students from other states. We can see no justification for continuance of this preference, if indeed it was ever justified, and we strongly recommend that steps be taken to abolish it, by legislation if necessary.

In addition to abolishing the preferential treatment now being given to residents of the District of Columbia, your Commission recommends the adoption by the state of the policy now followed by the State of Wisconsin. Any out-of-state student seeking entrance to the University of Wisconsin must pay the same tuition that the state university in his home state would require a student from Wisconsin to pay. This policy of reciprocity seems to us to have much to commend it.

Finally, we are enjoined to comment on the extent to which the University is complying with the conditions under



which state funds have been appropriated to it. This involves consideration of the very extensive controls which the state now maintains over the operations of the University. These are dealt with hereafter. At this point it is enough to say that the report of our survey staff has presented no evidence of any failure on the part of the University to comply with the terms under which appropriations have been made to it.

#### MORGAN STATE COLLEGE

With the exception of the courses offered at Princess Anne College and at the School of Law in Baltimore, Negroes do not at present attend the University of Maryland. In order to meet its constitutional obligations to afford equal educational opportunities to all of its citizens, the state is now operating Morgan State College. At that institution courses in the liberal arts and in the basic sciences, as well as courses in teacher training, are available to Negro students. However, Morgan State College in no sense parallels the activities of the University of Maryland. Thus, courses in agriculture and engineering are not offered, nor are any opportunities for professional study or graduate work available. In recognition of this fact, the state has awarded scholarships to Negroes so that they may pursue, at institutions beyond the borders of the state, courses not available to them in any state-controlled institution.

The report of our survey staff makes it clear that the money appropriated to Morgan State College is well spent and that the results being achieved are commendable. There does not appear to be any excessive subsidization of nonresident students, although the percentage of nonresident students is fairly high due in part to the fact that rather high tuition fees limit the number of residents who can afford to attend this institution. We have found no evidence of failure on the part of Morgan State College to comply with the conditions upon which appropriations have been made.



#### STATE TEACHERS COLLEGES

In addition to affording opportunity for graduate study in education and for the training of teachers at the University of Maryland and at Morgan State College, the state maintains four separate schools for the training of teachers in elementary schools. Those located at Frostburg, Towson, and Salisbury are for white students; that at Bowie for Negroes. The schools at Frostburg, Salisbury, and Bowie also operate junior college curriculums.

Our survey staff has made a careful study of the operation of these schools, but conditions are now so abnormal that it is difficult to reach any positive conclusions about the efficiency of their operation. It would be easy to say that the schools are operating at a high cost and that the number of teachers who are being developed is relatively small. However, the lack of economic incentive to enter the teaching profession seems to be primarily responsible for this condition.

We have been particularly impressed with the report on the activities at Frostburg. The number of teachers being trained at that institution is certainly very small in relation to the amount of money which the state is investing. This is in part due to the unfortunate location of the physical plant, which is extensively commented on in the report of our survey staff.

A further word should be said on the special subject of training Negro teachers. Teachers in the Negro elementary schools of Baltimore City are not offered training in any state institution, nor does the state afford, except through its scholarship program, any opportunity for Negroes to do graduate work in the field of education. However, the work being done at Bowie in training teachers for the elementary Negro schools of the state other than those in Baltimore City seems to be on a parity with that being done in the other state teachers colleges. Moreover, Baltimore City is conducting at municipal expense Coppin Teachers College for the

training of Negro elementary school teachers. Strictly speaking, this institution is no part of the state system of higher education.

#### ST. MARY'S FEMALE SEMINARY

The state is conducting a junior college for women at St. Mary's City. The findings of our survey staff show very clearly that this operation is without economic justification due to the small size of the institution and to its inaccessible location.

#### PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS RECEIVING STATE AID

##### Johns Hopkins University

Since 1912 the state has been contributing to the support of the School of Engineering of The Johns Hopkins University. Except for an original gift of \$600,000 for the erection of a building, the contribution has been principally in the form of scholarships. We shall hereafter comment at length on this question and on the principle involved. While your Commission has been unable to obtain from the authorities of The Johns Hopkins University financial information comparable to that made available by every other institution receiving appropriations of state funds (with the single exception of Princess Anne College), we have no reason to doubt that the funds appropriated to the Johns Hopkins School of Engineering have been well spent, that the results obtained have been excellent, that no substantial subsidy to nonresident students has been involved, and that there has been substantial compliance with the terms under which state appropriations have been made.

##### Western Maryland College

The state has supported through scholarships a program for training secondary school teachers at Western Maryland College. Our findings in reference to the School of Engineering of Johns Hopkins University are equally applicable here.

### Washington College

This institution has received generous state support in the form of scholarships. In recognition of the fact that it is essentially a state-supported institution, one-half of the members of the governing board of the College are appointed by the governor of the state. Our survey staff has found little fault with the manner in which the appropriated funds have been spent. Washington College affords residents of the Eastern Shore, who, for economic reasons, find it impossible to attend the University of Maryland, an opportunity to obtain an education in the liberal arts; at the same time, it furnishes a center of culture in a community which differs sharply from the rest of the state in many ways. As this institution because of its present crowded condition virtually excludes students who are not residents of the state, no question of subsidy to nonresidents is involved. However, there does seem to have been a failure on the part of this institution to comply with the conditions laid down by the legislature in appropriating funds to its support in that no effort appears to have been made to require female scholarship-holders to teach in the public schools.

### St. John's College

At St. John's College the state has been subsidizing a highly specialized course in general education from which few Maryland students benefit; in fact, our survey staff reports that no more than twenty-one Maryland students who pay their own tuition are now enrolled at St. John's College. Your Commission does not desire to enter the controversy which has so long raged in educational circles as to the value of the St. John's program. We note with interest the findings of our survey staff indicating that by the tests commonly used in measuring the performance of institutions of this character, St. John's ranks low. Frankly, we feel that these findings must be considered in the light of the fact (to which our survey staff also calls attention) that the usual criteria

are not applicable to the St. John's program because it is based on radically different assumptions from those accepted in preparing these criteria. We can safely say, however, that in relation to the money spent, the number of Maryland citizens who are benefited is very low indeed. We can also say that a substantial subsidy to nonresident students appears to be involved in this appropriation. Finally, we think that the findings of our survey staff make it clear that St. John's has not complied with the terms under which state appropriations have been made to it, in that the courses offered do not qualify scholarship students to teach the required period in the Maryland schools.

#### IV. A PLAN FOR THE FUTURE

If the slate could be wiped clean and a brand new system of institutions created for the post high school training of the youth of Maryland, your Commission would find it relatively easy to formulate a general plan or program to be followed by the state in meeting its obligations in the field of higher education for the future. Our task is not so simple. The fact, for example, that the College Park schools of the University of Maryland are located in the metropolitan area of Washington, rather than in the center of population of the state, is doubtless unfortunate, but it seems obvious to us that any plan which fails to take this fact into account would be worthless. Accordingly, we have tried to face realities and to frame our recommendations in such a way as to avoid the destruction of agencies which are of proved value. At the same time, we have not hesitated to recommend changes where it seemed clear to us that the future needs of the state could not be met without them or that the taxpayers' money was being wasted. In this connection we have been unable to ignore the fact stressed in chapter viii of the report of our survey staff that Maryland is supporting more different institutions of higher education than any comparable state in the union.

We have previously indicated, in broad outline, what, in our opinion, are the future needs of the state in the field of higher education. To meet those needs we propose the following program:

1. The establishment of a state-wide system of locally controlled junior college units where both white and Negro students will be offered two years of post secondary school training in a variety of subjects ranging from the liberal arts to strictly occupational studies.
2. The ultimate expansion of the University of Maryland to a capacity of 10,000 students with a curriculum offering both graduate and undergraduate instruction in the liberal

arts, the basic sciences, agriculture, business administration, engineering, and teaching as well as the principal professions.

3. The development of Morgan State College into an institution where Negroes can obtain both graduate and undergraduate instruction in the liberal arts, the basic sciences, agriculture, engineering, and teaching.

4. The establishment at the University of Maryland and Morgan State College, of separate courses for the training of teachers in the elementary schools.

5. The maintenance of Washington College as a liberal arts college under state control.

6. The repeal of existing scholarship legislation and the development of a system for awarding scholarships designed primarily to help outstanding students get the education for which they are qualified.

7. The maintenance as a state agency of the School of Engineering at Johns Hopkins University.

8. The abandonment of Frostburg State Teachers College, Coppin Teachers College, Princess Anne College, and St. Mary's Female Seminary.

9. The establishment of an adequate salary scale for members of the faculty of the various state-controlled institutions.

10. The erection of such new buildings and improvements as may be necessary to accomplish this program.

Your Commission proposes this program as a relatively long-range project to be completed over a period of years. We believe, however, that no time should be lost in working out the details so that a beginning may be made as promptly as possible. The report of our survey staff contains much information which should prove helpful in this connection.

## 1. A SYSTEM OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

Your Commission strongly recommends the establishment, at the earliest feasible moment, of junior college units in association or integration with selected high schools located in Baltimore City and in the counties. Although the report of our survey staff contains much helpful information on the point, we have thought it wiser to leave for further study the choice of the schools to be selected for the establishment of such units. Your Commission wishes to emphasize, however, that we are in complete agreement with the report of our survey staff on the paramount importance of maintaining the principle of localism in so far as it is possible to accomplish this. The data set forth in chapter vii of the survey report have convinced us that a large number of qualified students are in effect denied the opportunity to continue their training beyond high school because no courses are accessible to them within reach of their homes. This, we think, is the primary reason why the establishment of a soundly conceived junior college program is desirable.

We further agree with the findings of our survey staff that these units should be made available to all qualified applicants by the elimination of tuitions and by the establishment of a program of subsistence scholarships for those who cannot afford to live away from home while attending. This is particularly needed in connection with the operation of junior college units for Negro students since, for reasons clearly shown in the report of our survey staff, adherence to the principle of localism is especially difficult in this case.

In order to encourage such a program, we think that the junior college units should share in basic state aid just as do the lower schools. We also think that they should participate in equalization funds by being made a part of the state minimum-school program. We recognize that the financing of such a program will impose a substantial burden on the taxpayers and that it is much easier to propose additional expenditures than to find the funds with which to meet



them. However, the development of a junior college program along the lines recommended by our survey staff is, in our opinion, of great importance to the future well-being of this community, and if the state's ultimate annual share of the expense of the program does not exceed the estimate of \$350,000 made by our survey staff, it would seem to be not too onerous a burden. This estimate assumes that Baltimore City and each of the counties will make a contribution ranging from an estimated \$252,000 in the case of Baltimore City to \$7,800 in the case of Queen Anne's County. (See Table 57 in chapter vii of the survey report.) In this connection it should be noted that the establishment of junior colleges will permit the abandonment of junior college curriculums now being maintained at state expense at Bowie, Frostburg, and Salisbury.

Your Commission has given careful consideration to the strong recommendation of its survey staff that the curriculum of the junior colleges be sufficiently broad to include both preparatory and terminal courses. There is another view, however, that junior colleges should concentrate on terminal education with special emphasis on vocational studies. While we are impressed with the arguments presented in chapter vii of the survey report, we do not find it necessary at this time to choose between these competing views. The development of a sound junior college program will necessarily take time, and there will be opportunity for further exploration of this question in the light of future developments.

## 2. THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

It is with great reluctance that your Commission has reached the conclusion that further expansion of the University of Maryland will be necessary in the future. Aside from the increased burden on the taxpayers, which we deplore, the further growth of the University carries with it dangers which cannot be lightly dismissed. A passage in the annual report of the President of Johns Hopkins Uni-



versity delivered in November 1945 seems to us to put the matter very clearly:

Few are the schools that are both big and good. There is no substitute for a personal relation between teacher and student. Each must be an individual to the other. The fatal flaw in mass education is that entertainment is inseparable from a large lecture course. A student who desires merely to receive pleasurable impressions in the class room is wasting his time in a university. It is the student's effort, initiative, and talents that are to be called into play. This is a high ideal and the road to it is difficult because personal instruction is costly. The temptation is to instruct in large groups because it is cheaper, and all universities are needy all the time. . . . When a university succumbs to juvenile standards of entertainment and popularity the taxpayer is being cheated. When it relinquishes or fails to acquire creative intellectual power the public loses the benefit of modern knowledge—in its industries no less than in its secondary schools and in its cultural life.

Further increases in college enrollments may be expected in a year or two. The challenge to high intellectual standards will be renewed and intensified. In the name of "service," expansionist policies are more likely to win popular approval. The hard way, which leads to the truly prepared mind, will not be popular. The high standards of training of the football squad are not tolerated in the classrooms of far too many institutions.

We also think it important that the state should not duplicate the activities of private universities and colleges, but the chief asset of the private institution is its freedom to choose its own students and to limit the numbers of those students accordingly. The findings set forth in chapter ii of the survey report have convinced us that the private institutions of this state will not carry the load of educating the additional students who will have to be taken care of in future. Unless, therefore, we are to abandon the fundamental principles which we have tried to state at the outset of this report, your Commission believes that an increase in the size of the University of Maryland cannot be avoided.

In arriving at the figure of 10,000 as the future capacity of the University, we have been guided by the advice of our survey staff that experience has shown this to be the maximum number which can be handled in one institution without loss of efficiency. We agree with the prediction of our survey staff that the time is not far distant when enrollment at the University will reach this maximum figure. We have not overlooked the fact that a system of junior colleges, such as we have recommended, may reasonably be expected to absorb a number of students who would otherwise enroll elsewhere but according to our survey staff, experience elsewhere has shown that any such gain will be largely offset by the extent to which the junior colleges act as feeders for those institutions which offer more extended courses. While we doubt that the development of junior colleges will go far to reduce enrollment at the University of Maryland, we believe that it should permit the ultimate abandonment of some of the courses in which instruction is now offered.

Aside from the possible future effect of the junior college program, your Commission has given careful thought to the necessity for a continuance of everything that is now being done by the University of Maryland. We have, it is true, not felt it necessary to study those activities which are performed by the University primarily in its capacity as the State Board of Agriculture. Such activities as the new laboratory at Crisfield, for example, seem to us to be beyond the scope of our inquiry. In all other respects, however, we have attempted to satisfy ourselves that the program of the University is within the limits marked out by the needs of the state.

Apart from the Princess Anne project, the activities of the University of Maryland which have had our special attention are those conducted at the schools of medicine and nursing in Baltimore and at the College of Engineering at College Park.

#### A. The School of Medicine

The story of the Medical School may be briefly told. It has a long and honorable history of usefulness to the state. From its doors have come a high percentage of the physicians and surgeons who have practiced in this community. Withal, it has been operated with only a minimum of state support. The time has now come when a change is imperative. It is no longer possible to maintain a good medical school on tuition fees nor can adequate teaching facilities be afforded by a hospital which must look to revenues from private patients for its principal support. Furthermore, the exigencies of a modern medical school seem to demand the appointment of full-time men to head the various clinical departments as well as to other key positions. Part-time men simply cannot find the time to teach, to perform a myriad of administrative duties, and to conduct enough investigatory work to keep themselves in touch with the swiftly moving current of medical knowledge. At least that is the view presented to us by our survey staff which we accept for the purposes of this report.

The necessary changes can be postponed no longer. Already the Medical School faces a near crisis. Unless steps are taken promptly, it will be impossible to hold on the faculty and staff those young men who are the backbone of any good medical school. The time is not far off when the University of Maryland Medical School will lose its accredited status and no longer be worthy of support by the state.

The question immediately arises where the money is coming from to carry out the necessary changes. That they will be expensive cannot be doubted. The budget request already made for the next biennium is merely a foretaste of what is to come. Your Commission has had the opportunity to examine a plan of future development prepared by the faculty of the Medical School under the supervision of the Dean. To carry out that plan in every detail would cost

more than \$400,000 annually over and above current appropriations.

It is vain to hope for additional revenues from tuitions. The report of our survey staff shows that students at the University of Maryland School of Medicine are already paying as much as, if not more than, those at private medical schools of equal or greater reputation. If the Medical School is to look to the state for its principal support in future, its tuitions must be lowered, not raised. It will be hard to defend a condition under which students are obliged to pay more for admission to a state-operated institution than for admission to a private school where they can obtain an equally good education.

There seem to be only two courses which your Commission could recommend in view of these facts. The first is to abandon the School of Medicine altogether. The second is to increase appropriations sufficient to maintain it adequately. In choosing between these recommendations, we have asked our survey staff to analyze the needs of the state for medical service as well as the opportunities which might be available to its citizens to obtain medical education elsewhere. They have not, of course, overlooked the presence of the Johns Hopkins School of Medicine with its international reputation for excellence. They are satisfied, however, that that institution cannot be expected to train all those Maryland boys whose future work in life should be the practice of medicine, nor can it supply the state with all the practitioners who will be needed to give its citizens adequate medical care. In view of present conditions, they likewise doubt whether out-of-state institutions of equal reputation can be expected to take on the load which the University of Maryland Medical School now carries.

Accordingly, we feel obliged to recommend increased state support for the University of Maryland Medical School. The exact extent of such support should not be determined, it seems to us, until after a thoroughgoing survey has been made of the School of Medicine and the University Hospital

and of their relation to a long-range plan for the future development of medical care for the people of this state. Had your Commission been qualified for this task, it would have lacked the time to perform it. It appears to us, however, to be an urgent need, and we, therefore, strongly recommend that a group of qualified experts be selected to conduct such a survey and to prepare a program for the further development of those institutions and their integration in a system of medical care designed to meet the future needs of the state as a whole. We are satisfied that such a group will obtain invaluable assistance from the plan to which reference has already been made as well as from the studies which have been made by the Committee on Medical Care of the State Planning Commission.

#### B. The School of Nursing

The School of Nursing stands alone among the professional schools maintained by the University of Maryland in lacking complete accreditation. No one familiar with the desperate need for nursing services that exists today can doubt the advisability of maintaining the School of Nursing of the University of Maryland. If it is to be maintained, we think that it should be maintained on an adequate basis and that the necessary steps should be accomplished to permit the school to obtain a fully accredited status.

#### C. The College of Engineering

The problem of the College of Engineering of the University of Maryland is principally one of geography. We have already noted that the location of the College Park schools is, in many respects, an unhappy one. This is especially true in its relation to those students who need engineering training, by far the greater percentage of whom are located in the metropolitan area of Baltimore. The report of our survey staff leads us to emphasize the significance of accessibility in estimating the value of an institution as an educational agency. It seems to be established by indis-

putable evidence that the percentage of students who attend school or college away from their homes is not large. It should be borne in mind also that students who are looking for engineering training often come from the lower economic levels, where the difficulties of commuting or of living away from home are especially great.

The facts developed by our survey staff show that these are not merely theoretical fears. They show that less than 40 percent of the present enrollment at the College of Engineering at College Park come from the metropolitan area of Baltimore. By contrast, more than 40 percent come from the metropolitan area of Washington.

There are several things that might be done about this. Our recommendation for the establishment of a system of junior colleges, if carried out, would result in improvement. Your Commission has considered yet a further possibility, namely, the transfer of the College of Engineering to Baltimore City. In this connection we have also given thought to its possible consolidation with the School of Engineering of the Johns Hopkins University which is also supported by the state. There are obvious objections to any such course. The physical facilities now available at College Park and those which will be available in the near future as the result of the gift of The Glenn L. Martin Company present an imposing obstacle. The desirability of integrating a course in engineering with instruction in the basic sciences presents another. Obtaining the consent of the Board of Trustees of the Johns Hopkins University to any form of consolidation under state supervision may well prove impossible. For the reasons just stated, we do not feel able to recommend the discontinuance of the College of Engineering at College Park.

### 3. MORGAN STATE COLLEGE

We turn now to the thorny problem created by the long-standing practice, deeply woven into the social fabric of this state, of separation of the races. Your Commission has tried to face this problem honestly and to meet squarely



the issues which it presents. We are fully aware of the constitutional obligation upon the state to afford equal educational facilities to Negroes and whites alike—an obligation which seems to us to be inherent in a democracy. We are equally aware of the difficulties which lie in the way of complete fulfillment of this obligation so long as the principle of maintaining separate schools is carried through graduate and professional instruction. While we recommend no change in the practices now being followed in this respect, we are convinced that their successful continuance depends upon the willingness and ability of the state to improve the facilities which it now offers for the higher education of Negroes.

At present the state is scattering its shots badly. Princess Anne College and Morgan State College are each performing some part of the functions which the University of Maryland performs for white students. The gaps are being filled in by a scholarship program administered by Morgan State College under which provision is made for attendance at institutions beyond the borders of the state by those Negro students who require training which is not available at any local Negro institution.

It seems to us that there are manifest defects in this system. Our survey staff has strongly recommended the designation of Morgan State College as the land-grant college for Negroes in this state and the abandonment of the operations at Princess Anne. Your Commission concurs in this recommendation. We can see no hope of developing at Princess Anne an institution in any way comparable to the agricultural and mechanical schools at College Park. The obstacles in the way of developing such an institution at Morgan State College seem to us to be far less formidable. We recognize that it may be desirable for the time being to continue certain activities at Princess Anne, and we, therefore, recommend that the physical facilities located there be transferred to the control of Morgan State College.

Your Commission believes that the time has come for Morgan State College to assume the burden of graduate in-

struction in the field of teacher training. The number of out-of-state scholarships now being awarded for that purpose is quite large, and continued failure to provide opportunities for such training within the borders of the state is difficult to justify.

A further suggestion in a special report made to our survey director that operations at Bowie be transferred to Princess Anne seems to us unwise. We think that a much stronger case could be made for transferring those activities to Morgan State College along with the activities now being conducted at Coppin Teachers College in Baltimore City. This, however, is a question which we will discuss hereafter in connection with future plans for the state teachers colleges as a whole.

In addition to the changes in organization which we have recommended, your Commission feels bound to call attention to the relatively inadequate financial support which Morgan State College has been receiving from the state. We have been shocked by the comparison presented to us by our survey staff between the expenditure per student at Morgan State College and at every other comparable institution in the state for which figures are available. We think that these figures speak for themselves and call for no elaboration on our part.

It seems to us that the state's obligation to afford equal facilities requires the adoption of a policy of supporting institutions for the higher education of whites and of Negroes at the same financial level. Specifically, we make the following recommendations:

a) That any racial discrimination with respect to the salaries paid to the staff and faculty between institutions for white and Negro students should be eliminated and that the maintenance of nondiscriminatory salaries should have the special attention of the proper authorities of the state.

b) That the state budget provide such annual appropriations for institutions for the higher education of Negroes that the activities being conducted at those institutions may



be maintained on a basis equal in quality to those maintained in comparable state institutions for white students.

c) That in order to bring Negro institutions to the level of white institutions, sufficient additional funds be immediately appropriated to Morgan State College and to the State Teachers College at Bowie to enable them to qualify for national accreditation status equivalent to that held by the comparable institutions for white students.

d) That specific provision be made for the land-grant college for Negroes to have an equitable share of the federal funds allocated to the state for agricultural extension and for research in agriculture and the mechanical arts.

#### 4. TEACHER TRAINING

Your Commission is not entirely satisfied that the practice of training elementary school teachers in separate institutions is a sound one. The report of our survey staff sets forth, it seems to us, strong reasons for believing that equally good results could be obtained at considerably less cost if this function were assigned to the University of Maryland and to Morgan State College and if separate courses for training elementary school teachers were maintained at these institutions. The University of Maryland is already offering courses of this character, and we have previously recommended that Morgan State College offer graduate instruction in the field of education. We think that the addition of separate courses for the training of elementary school teachers at Morgan State College would be a logical development.

We recognize, however, that the present critical shortage of teachers in the elementary schools makes it imperative not to make any move at this time which might reduce the flow of new teachers into the school system of the state. For this reason we do not recommend the discontinuance for the present of the state teachers colleges at Bowie, Towson, or Salisbury. However, we strongly recommend that this question be given further study, in the light of the considerations summarized in chapter viii of the report of our survey staff.

Your Commission does feel obliged to recommend the prompt discontinuance of the State Teachers College at Frostburg. We are convinced that the cost of operating this unit is not justified by the very small number of its graduates who are entering the school system of the state as teachers. In reaching this conclusion, we have been strongly influenced by the report of our survey staff as to the present condition of the physical facilities at Frostburg. It is apparent that the state faces a heavy capital expenditure if operations at that location are to be continued. Frankly, such an outlay seems to us to be an indefensible waste of public money.

We think that the junior college courses now available at Frostburg would be much more useful if given at a junior college located in Cumberland and properly integrated with a local high school. We see no reason why the abandonment of the State Teachers College at Frostburg should result in the loss of any teachers to the state school system. The facilities in Towson are adequate to care for all the students at Frostburg who are now studying to become teachers. They can easily be expanded to meet future needs, and an adequate program of scholarships could offer sufficient financial inducements to overcome any reluctance which prospective students from western Maryland might otherwise feel to leave the vicinity of their homes.

Another step which we think should now be taken is the abandonment by Baltimore City of Coppin Teachers College and the assumption by the state of the responsibility for training teachers for the Negro elementary schools of Baltimore City. At present this city draws both its elementary and secondary school teachers in the white schools from state-supported institutions but feels obliged to train its own teachers for the Negro elementary schools. Our survey staff reports that the results are not satisfactory and recommends that the task of training Negro elementary school teachers for the Negro schools be assigned to Morgan State College. Your Commission is fully in accord with this recommendation.

## 5. WASHINGTON COLLEGE

Your Commission is not recommending any radical departure from existing practice in proposing the maintenance, as a state-controlled institution, of a liberal arts college on the Eastern Shore of Maryland. In all but name Washington College is such an institution. One-half of the governing board is now appointed by the governor of the state, and the state bears substantially the entire burden of paying the difference between the cost of operating this institution and the revenues from tuitions. The President of Washington College has frankly stated that every student at the College is to that extent the beneficiary of a state scholarship. It would only be recognizing facts to transfer the facilities of this institution to the state and to provide for the appointment of its entire governing board by the state, with the provision suggested by our survey staff that the governor name a part of the board from candidates suggested by the alumni.

The question remains whether the state is justified in maintaining a separate liberal arts college on the Eastern Shore. We think that it is. In many respects the Eastern Shore of Maryland is a community separate and apart from the rest of the state. Washington College has been a center of culture for that community for a very long time. We should hesitate long before recommending its abandonment. We have considered the effect on the future usefulness of Washington College of the inauguration of a junior college program such as we have recommended. The immediate effect may well be to reduce the enrollment at Washington College, but in the long run we are inclined to the view that this condition will not be permanent. Here again re-examination of this question at some future date seems desirable.

Your Commission would like to emphasize that it is not recommending that Washington College be incorporated into the University of Maryland. Such a consolidation would, it seems to us, take away the major reason for the continued existence of the institution. It is because Washington Col-

lege has developed its own unique place in the cultural life of the Eastern Shore that we believe that the state is justified in continuing to support it. Consolidation with the University of Maryland would, we think, inevitably tend to deprive the institution of its special characteristics.

#### 6. A SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Your Commission has included in its program for the future the establishment of a system of scholarships designed primarily to assist qualified students who would otherwise be unable to continue their post high school training. We are convinced that such a program is essential if true equality of opportunity is to be given to the youth of this state. We repeat what we have said before, that we believe that many Maryland boys and girls who are able and willing to continue their education beyond high school are failing to do so for no other reason than their inability to pay the cost—a reason which we believe to be a reproach to this state. Here we would like once again to point out how hard it is for the poorer students to attend schools which require them to live away from home. We do not think that the importance of this can be too strongly emphasized.

Your Commission envisions a system of scholarships flexible enough to take care of a variety of needs. It should make possible the attendance of Negroes at junior college units which are located too far away for them to remain at their homes; it should take care of the students from Garrett County who want to enter the Towson State Teachers College; it should help the boy from Essex or Dundalk who wants to attend the School of Aeronautical Engineering at College Park; it should take care of the girl from Snow Hill who wants to take a course in secondary education at Western Maryland College, and it should make possible attendance at Morgan State College by worthy Negro students who cannot afford to pay the tuition fees. These are but a few illustrations of the many situations which a soundly conceived program of scholarships would have to take into ac-

count. Such a system should, we think, be administered by a central agency which would estimate the amount needed and present periodic requests to the governor and to the legislature, just as other items are presented which are to be included in the state budget.

We think that this body should have a wide discretion, within the amount appropriated, to fix the number and amount of scholarships and to attach such conditions as it might find necessary. From time to time the interests of the state might require the encouragement of particular courses of study; a shortage, for example, of teachers or of nurses might be met by the award of scholarships encouraging entrance into those professions. Such scholarships could be limited to institutions within the state which were qualified to give adequate instruction in the particular field.

Ideally, perhaps, all of these scholarships should be allotted without regard to geographical or other considerations. In view, however, of the time-honored method by which scholarships have been awarded in this state, we would suggest that a fixed number (perhaps one-half) of these scholarships be allotted among the districts of Baltimore City and the counties in proportion to their respective population as shown by the most recent census and that these scholarships be awarded to individuals chosen by the members of the state senate from the particular districts from among candidates selected after competitive examination. It should be noted that these particular scholarships would differ from those now provided by existing legislation only in that they would give the student the choice of the institution to be attended.

In order to accomplish this program, we recommend the repeal of all existing scholarship legislation (except that relating to the out-of-state scholarships awarded by the trustees' committee of Morgan State College to Negro students who want instruction in courses not available at any state-supported institution located within the borders of this state) and the enactment of entirely new legislation. In drafting

such legislation we recommend that specific provision be made for a fair and equitable allotment of scholarships to worthy Negro students for study at either Morgan State College or Bowie State Teachers College.

We think it important to emphasize that no genuine system of state scholarships now exists. What we have is a hodge-podge which has grown up over a period of more than a century as a result of a desire to meet a specialized demand here or to assist a particular institution there. We believe that nobody who has taken the trouble to read chapter iv of the report of our survey staff will be able to defend our scholarship system as it now exists.

At this point it may be well to emphasize the distinction between a scholarship program and a program of state aid to privately controlled institutions. It seems to your Commission that a subsidy is one thing and a scholarship another. One should be designed primarily to aid the institution, the other to help the student. Failure to bear this in mind can lead only to a continuance of the present confusion.

Aside from any question of concealed subsidy, no institution which now benefits from existing scholarship legislation should suffer from its repeal. We have not overlooked the consideration stressed by the President of Western Maryland College that existing legislation insures a steady flow of students to the department of education of that institution. We believe that this objection can be met satisfactorily by a flexible administration of the scholarship program which we have suggested. Aside from special situations of this kind, your Commission has every reason to feel confident that any institution of higher education which is worth its salt will have no need to worry about getting enough students in the foreseeable future. If circumstances should change hereafter, it will, of course, be possible to revise the state's policy.



## 7. THE JOHNS HOPKINS SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING

We have previously given our reasons for thinking that the state needs a school of engineering located in the metropolitan area of Baltimore. Such a school has been maintained at The Johns Hopkins University since 1912. As has been previously stated, the buildings in which this school is housed were built with state funds, and the state has been making annual contributions roughly equivalent to the difference between the cost of operating the school and the revenues from tuition fees. It appears, therefore, that the School of Engineering at The Johns Hopkins University has been supported by the state, and it would seem not unreasonable to conclude that it should be classified as a state agency. President Bowman has frankly stated that the University so regards it.

Your Commission believes that the need for an engineering school located in Baltimore can best be met by continued support of the School of Engineering at Johns Hopkins University. Accordingly, your Commission recommends that in the event of repeal of the present legislation providing for scholarships, a direct appropriation be substituted in the amount of approximately \$80,000 for the biennium 1947-49. At the same time, your Commission believes that further support of this institution should be conditioned upon the establishment of an arrangement which would insure the same fiscal controls that are applicable to state-controlled institutions. The nature of these controls is discussed at a later point in this report.

## 8. THE ABANDONMENT OF PRINCESS ANNE COLLEGE, ST. MARY'S FEMALE SEMINARY, COPPIN TEACHERS COLLEGE, AND FROSTBURG STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE

The reasons why your Commission recommends abandonment of Princess Anne College, Coppin Teachers College, and Frostburg Teachers College have already been given. As to St. Mary's Female Seminary, it seems to your Com-

mission that the findings of our survey staff permit of but one conclusion. Apart from sentiment, there can be no sound reason for continuing the existence of this institution. As a memorial to the founders of the state, it is unduly costly; its inaccessible location, small size, and lack of accredited status make it unfit for inclusion in a well-integrated system of institutions of higher education. To bring St. Mary's Female Seminary up to standard would increase the cost per student, already abnormally high, and would, in our opinion, be an unjustifiable expenditure of public money.

#### 9. AN ADEQUATE SALARY SCALE

Your Commission has been impressed with the facts developed in chapter v of the survey report relating to the salaries paid to the faculties of the various state-controlled institutions. It is surprising to us to learn that the state teachers colleges surpass the University of Maryland in the average level of faculty salaries. At the same time, the salaries paid at the state teachers colleges are apparently well below those paid in other similar institutions elsewhere. Furthermore, even though the salaries paid by the University of Maryland are well below the level paid elsewhere, they are well above the salaries paid at Morgan State College. We are frankly shocked to learn that half of the salaries paid to members of the faculty of Morgan State College are less than \$2,250 and that the maximum salary paid is \$3,350, or less than one-half the maximum salary paid at the University of Maryland. In this connection it is significant that the maximum salary paid by the University of Maryland is far below the level paid in many of the better institutions of the country so that it is virtually impossible to avoid loss of those on whom the scholarly reputation of the university most depends.

#### 10. A FUTURE BUILDING PROGRAM

It will, we think, be obvious that any building program must depend upon the general program which the state is



to follow. Since, in many respects, your Commission has felt obliged to leave for future determination important questions affecting the future program of the state in the field of higher education, any recommendations which we make for a building program must be qualified accordingly. We have thought it appropriate, however, to take advantage of the presence on our survey staff of experts in this field to have a study made of the physical facilities of the institutions now owned and operated by the state. Such a study has been made and the findings of our survey staff will be found in chapter vi of the survey report. These findings include a list of needs prepared in their order of priority. Your Commission offers this list for what it is worth.

## **V. THE RELATION BETWEEN THE STATE AND THE INSTITUTIONS WHICH IT SUPPORTS**

Aside from state-owned and operated institutions which receive the bulk of state funds, the taxpayers are presently contributing more than \$300,000 a year to institutions which are privately owned and controlled. This includes \$60,000 for Washington College which, as we have noted, is partially controlled by the state.

These private institutions furnish the state a partial return for the funds contributed to them by making scholarships available to a number of students, but, as the report of our survey staff shows, the cost of these scholarships, except in the case of Western Maryland College, is considerably less than the amount appropriated. These concealed subsidies, for that is what they are, carry no strings attached to them. They are outright gifts which the institutions can spend without accounting to any state agency for the manner in which they are spent. By contrast, the expenditures of state-owned institutions, including the University of Maryland and Morgan State College, are subjected to the most detailed control. Every substantial purchase made by these institutions must be routed through the State Purchasing Bureau; the salary of every member of the faculty must be approved in detail by the Board of Public Works; clerical and administrative positions must be filled and salaries paid in accordance with regulations established by the State Employment Commissioner and the State Standards Salary Board; and every penny of expenditure is subject to state audit.

Your Commission believes that it is impossible to make sense out of the conflicting policies which the state is now following in relation to the educational institutions which benefit from state appropriations. If it is a wise policy to give large sums to the School of Engineering at Johns Hopkins University to be spent without supervision or control

by any state agency, then why is it necessary to enmesh the College of Engineering at College Park in the web of bureaucratic control set up for the administrative departments of the state government? This points, it seems to us, to an even more fundamental question: is it sound policy for this state to continue to appropriate funds to institutions over which it exercises no control?

In discussing our proposal for the development of a sound program of scholarships, we have recommended the repeal of all legislation under which state aid is now being given to private institutions. If the payments being made to any particular institution do not exceed the cost of educating the scholarship students, no loss would result from such a repeal. Western Maryland College is a case in point. The President of the College informs us that the state appropriation does not cover the actual cost of educating those students who have state scholarships. On the other hand, the repeal of existing legislation will deprive Johns Hopkins University of an annual subsidy which may be in the neighborhood of \$79,000, St. John's College of an annual subsidy estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$32,000, and Washington College of an annual subsidy estimated to be in the neighborhood of \$28,500.

We have already recommended that Washington College be taken over by the state. This would impose on the state, as a direct charge, the liability to make up the difference between the revenues and operating costs of that institution exactly as in the case of the University of Maryland or Morgan State College.

The case of St. John's College is more difficult. Aside from all other considerations, the unique character of the program of this institution and its radical departure from accepted norms would make us hesitate long before recommending its operation as a state-controlled institution. In any event, we have no reason to think that such a solution would be acceptable to the governing board of the College. Here the issue must be faced whether to continue state aid

and, if so, upon what terms. Your Commission recommends that state aid be discontinued. We think that the very small number of Maryland boys who are attending St. John's College, the very high cost of operation, and the complete lack of national accreditation furnish convincing arguments in favor of this course. Whatever may be the merits of the St. John's program, it is benefiting only a handful of our citizens. We think that the state has gone as far as can reasonably be expected in support of so esoteric an activity.

There remains for consideration the School of Engineering at Johns Hopkins University. While, as we have seen, this school is regarded by the University as an agency of the state, the fact is that the state exercises no control whatsoever over its activities. This is illustrated by the inability of your Commission's survey staff to obtain pertinent financial information for the purposes of their survey. Thus, we must face the fundamental question upon which the legislature has asked our views, namely, what should be the relation between the several higher educational institutions receiving state funds and the state?

Your Commission is strongly of the opinion that as a matter of general principle, state funds should be appropriated only to institutions that are under state control. We recognize, however, that there may be exceptional circumstances which justify a departure from that principle. Where an exception to the general rule is justified, it is our view that protection of the state demands as a minimum requirement that fiscal controls be established substantially similar to those applicable to state-controlled institutions. Accordingly, your Commission has heretofore recommended that any continued support beyond the biennium 1947-49 to the School of Engineering at Johns Hopkins University be conditioned upon the establishment of an arrangement which will meet this minimum requirement.

The exact nature of this arrangement should, we think, be left for further study. There are a number of methods by which the desired result can be reached, some of which

are described in the report of our survey staff. The important thing is to end the present anomalous situation whereby the trustees of The Johns Hopkins University, in whose choice the state plays no part, are free to spend state money without any control or accounting, while, at the same time, the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland, who are chosen by the governor, are subject to the strictest regulation.

The possibility must be faced that the trustees of The Johns Hopkins University may refuse their cooperation in any plan of state supervision or control. If such a situation should arise, the state will have to face squarely the issue whether the practice of turning public funds over to private institutions without restriction should be permitted to continue. The increasing financial difficulties which all private educational institutions are facing underscore the importance of this issue. It may well be that the time is not far distant when many other private educational institutions will be looking to the state for financial help. It will be difficult to find a reason for discriminating between any of these institutions. In this connection we are not impressed with the argument that the history of the founding of the School of Engineering at Homewood imposes a special obligation on the state. We think that the state's obligation to continue support to the Engineering School at The Johns Hopkins University is no broader than its obligation to give similar support to any other private institution which is performing a useful service in the field of education.

We can readily understand why the trustees of The Johns Hopkins University might hesitate to involve any department of that institution in the mass of red tape which now surrounds the operation of state-controlled institutions. That objection can, it seems to us, be met by a change in the system of state control which is now in effect. Accordingly, your Commission has examined with some care the regulations now governing the operation of state institutions of higher education in an effort to determine whether they

should be modified. We agree with the recommendation of our survey staff that substantial modifications are desirable.

There are certain fundamentals which we think must be observed. It seems to us that the governor, in preparing his budget, and the legislature, in passing upon it, are entitled to the assurance that the amounts requested by any educational institution have been carefully sifted by its governing body. In our judgment, it is not enough that the governing body meet annually for a few days and approve the president's requests. Any institution requesting state funds should be able to show that a committee of its governing board is constantly in touch with the development of the program of the institution and with its financial requirements so that the recommendation of the board will carry with it the judgment of more than one man. The report of our survey staff shows only too clearly that this situation does not generally exist among the institutions of this state.

Secondly, it seems to us that some independent agency of the state should review the budget requests of the various state institutions and should be authorized to require a fully detailed explanation of the manner in which state appropriations are to be spent. The Board of Public Works which now performs this function seems to us to be ill-fitted for the job. What is needed is a body specializing in the problems of higher education with a full-time executive officer with power to take prompt action. Review by such a body would serve as a means of integrating the state's entire program in the field of education.

Your Commission is likewise of the opinion that a full accounting should be required of state funds expended by any institution. We think that the controls now maintained by the Office of the State Comptroller and the State Treasurer should be continued. We also agree with the view that the periodic publication of full reports of the manner in which its funds are spent should be required of every institution receiving an appropriation from the state. For this purpose the publication of an annual treasurer's report simi-



lar to that published by the University of Maryland for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, should be required. We understand that publication by the University of Maryland of such reports was suspended as a wartime economy. Now that the emergency has passed, we strongly recommend that the practice of publishing such reports be promptly resumed. In addition, audit by state officials is, in our opinion, an essential safeguard.

Whether any further control should be imposed upon the activities of our state institutions of higher education is a question which we think should be left for future determination. For the reasons given in chapter iii of the report of our survey staff, we are satisfied that these institutions should be exempted from the operation of the laws governing state purchasing and employment. We think that the fact must be recognized that an educational institution differs fundamentally from an administrative department of the state government and that regulations properly applicable to the one need not necessarily apply to the other. On the other hand, it may well be that a body such as we have suggested in discussing the scholarship program, which would be expert in the problems of higher education could properly exercise a considerable measure of control over the purchasing and employment practices of all state-controlled institutions of higher education. The report of our survey staff has suggested that such a body might be authorized to act for the State Employment Commissioner and the State Purchasing Bureau. In this way adequate protection could be afforded to the state against extravagant purchasing or against violation of the principles of the merit system of employment.

Accordingly, if a permanent State Board of Higher Education is created, as is hereinafter suggested, your Commission recommends that there be vested in that body such authority over purchasing by all state-controlled institutions of higher education and over the employment of classified personnel by such institutions as is now vested in other independent state agencies.



## **VI. A PERMANENT STATE BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION**

Your Commission has saved until the last discussion of the recommendation which seems to us to be by all odds the most important which we have to make. It should be evident to anyone who has read what has gone before that we have been able to suggest solutions to only a few of the major problems which face the state in the field of higher education and that those solutions should not be regarded as final. To furnish answers to the unsolved questions and to re-examine periodically the answers previously made calls for the existence of a single permanent body with over-all authority similar to that conferred upon your Commission by the legislature.

Such a body could assist the State Board of Education and the Board of School Commissioners of Baltimore City in the development of a junior college program which would be properly related to the entire state system of higher education. It could mold a system of state scholarships, such as we have recommended, so as to meet the changing needs of the state and of its citizens. It would be the logical agency to conduct those special investigations in the field of medical education and teacher training which we have already mentioned as urgently needed. In short, it would be the agency for carrying out the program which we have previously outlined in this report, with such modifications as might, after further study, be found to be advisable in the light of changing conditions.

In addition, such a body would be the logical agency to possess the authority over institutions of higher education now exercised by other state agencies. It should have the responsibility for reviewing budget requests prior to their submission to the Director of the Budget. It should possess the authority now exercised by the Board of Public Works to require the presentation of detailed breakdowns of the

manner in which the funds appropriated to the institutions of higher education are to be spent. It should have power to exercise such authority over purchases made by state-controlled institutions of higher education and over the employment of classified personnel by such institutions as it may determine to be necessary for the protection of the interest of the state. In general, it should be charged with the duty of periodic review and integration of the programs of all of the institutions of higher education which are receiving support from the state. It should see to it that the policies of equal support of Negro and white institutions previously laid down in this report are observed. It should have authority to collect statistical information concerning privately controlled schools and institutions of higher education.

We suggest that this body be called the State Board of Higher Education. It should, we think, include among its membership the chairman of the State Board of Education, the chairman of the Board of Trustees of Johns Hopkins University, the chairman of the Board of Regents of the University of Maryland, the chairman of the Board of Visitors and Trustees of Washington College, and the chairman of the Board of Trustees of Morgan State College. A majority of the members of the board should be appointed by the governor, with the consent of the senate, from persons not connected with any institution of higher education receiving state aid, and the chairman of the board should be chosen from among these independent members. In the opinion of your Commission, at least one representative of the Negro race should at all times serve as a member of the board.

If such a board is to function usefully, it must have available to it at all times the services of a permanent full-time paid executive officer charged with responsibility for keeping the board informed of all problems which may arise in the field of higher education. This officer, who should be selected by the board, would be the head of the state system of higher education, just as the State Superintendent of Schools is the head of the state system of secondary and elementary education. The board should have full power to

delegate to this officer authority to act on its behalf when the board is not in session. We suggest that this officer might appropriately be called the Chancellor of the State of Maryland.

The need for such an agency seems to your Commission to be beyond question. The task of post high school training, already spread among a number of institutions, may be even more widely distributed in future through the development of junior colleges. This will more than offset the possible consolidation or abandonment of existing agencies which may take place as the result of our recommendations or any recommendations which may be made hereafter. To permit the continued uncoordinated development and expansion of the work of these several agencies must, it seems to us, inevitably lead to waste of public money. Experience in other states, to which our survey staff has drawn attention in chapter viii of their report, shows that such a body can help greatly to bring it about that, at the least possible cost to the taxpayers, every Maryland boy and girl shall be assured of a chance to prepare for a useful and satisfying life.

## VII. CONCLUSION

Your Commission is well aware that this report has dealt with a very large subject in a very summary manner. The field which we have had to cover in this report is so broad that we have been obliged to confine ourselves largely to the statement of conclusions. For this reason we particularly urge those interested in this subject to read with care the able and comprehensive report of our survey staff upon which our conclusions have been based.

While we have made every effort to suggest measures which might result in savings to the taxpayers, we fully realize that the program which we have recommended will necessarily involve an increased contribution by the state to its institutions of higher education. This we believe to be inescapable if the state is not to default on its obligation to its youth. Anyone who reads chapter iv of the report of our survey staff cannot escape the conclusion that this state has failed to make adequate provision for post secondary school training. This is a condition which reflects upon the good reputation of the state. In calling for its correction, we offer no apologies.

T. HOWARD DUCKETT  
ARTHUR H. HAWKINS  
JOHN M. McFALL  
E. L. MILES  
MRS. JOHN C. SHAW  
HARVEY B. STONE  
TALBOT T. SPEER  
WILLIAM L. MARBURY, *Chairman*

## VIII. MINORITY REPORT

SUBMITTED BY CARL MURPHY

With the exception of the question considered in this minority report, I am in substantial agreement with the foregoing report of the Commission.

The Commission, in its recommendations, has given full consideration to provisions for higher education of the colored citizens of the state at the undergraduate level.

It is apparent, however, that the majority report does not face squarely the problem of the graduate and professional education of the colored citizens of the state.

I do not agree that the state can afford to continue as permanent policy, the present unconstitutional provision for the out-of-state education of colored students at the graduate and professional level. Above all, the state itself must act in a lawful manner if respect for government is to be maintained.

I recommend, therefore, *that the present state scholarship plan for colored students be discontinued; and that colored students be accepted at the University of Maryland in those curriculums which are not offered at a state institution of higher education for colored students.*

As our survey staff report points out, "Only if the state otherwise provides what the courts will accept as true equivalence of opportunity, will the courts tolerate any exclusion of any race from any facility provided."

Thus the state cannot *lawfully* provide medical education, for example, for white students only.

The Supreme Court of the United States has further ruled that providing scholarships for out-of-state study does not relieve the state of the obligation of providing *within the state* equal educational facilities for the colored and white populations.

Our survey staff, consequently, points out that, "The present plan of providing out-of-state scholarships does not meet the requirements that have been laid down by the courts."

The survey staff reviews the two possible solutions to this problem in chapter viii of the preliminary draft of its report:

The most economical method of providing instruction in courses where the number of Negroes to be served is small would be to open up such facilities to Negroes in the University of Maryland.

This has already been done in the Law School of the University.

It is understood, furthermore, that Johns Hopkins University is willing to admit Negro students to its graduate courses; it has had no qualified applicants because its graduate program is limited to those desiring the doctor's degree, while Negroes in general want to take a master's degree.

The precedents that have already been set in the state suggest the possibility of providing specialized instruction for Negroes, where the groups to be served are small, at the University of Maryland. Whether this is in accord with social policies of the state is naturally for the state authorities to decide.

Further, if there is any substantial number of Negroes needing any professional or graduate curriculum, it should be developed and maintained at Morgan State College.

The only remaining alternative is to build up at one of the Negro college centers a complete program of graduate and professional instruction practically as extensive as that of the University of Maryland.

Morgan State College is the only institution which shows any possibility of any such development, and the creation of the necessary facilities for a complete offering of professional and graduate work would require many millions of capital outlay and annual maintenance budgets running well into seven figures.

*The problem cannot be solved by creating makeshift arrangements involving substandard programs at the Negro institutions.*

The state can be legally compelled to maintain curriculums for Negroes which are equal in extent and quality to those provided for white students.

*It would be unfortunate for the state to be compelled by legal means to take steps to provide suitable facilities for Negro students.*

The second alternative discussed above is clearly not really an alternative.

It is manifestly impossible for the state to maintain "separate and equal" courses of study in all fields for colored and white. The state could not maintain two equal medical schools, two dental schools, two aeronautical institutes, etc., even if it had the funds to do so, because the small number of colored students to be served would not permit effective operation of the program.

The only constitutional alternative is to admit colored and white students to the same curriculums at the University of Maryland. I believe that the state must now face this question and set its policy for the ensuing year.



